

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11, 13-18 and 20-23 are now present in this application.

The specification and claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 22 have been amended, and claims 2, 6, 12 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The disclosure is objected to because the word “salt” is misspelled on page 13. This has been corrected. Also, on page 6 of the specification, and in amended claims 1, 4, 12 and 17, “silicon” and not “silicone” is now used. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the disclosure should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The specification stands objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for certain claimed subject matter. However, the formula of claims 6, 12 and 19 and now found in claims 1, 10 and 17, is discussed in the last paragraph of page 6. Regarding a reduction gas, an optional fourth step of using a reduction gas is brought out in the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the specification. There, it is expressly recited that there is sintering in a reduction gas. Thus, the method of claims 8, 14 and 21 should have proper antecedent basis in the specification. Regarding claim 16, the first paragraph of page 9 of the specification notes an inflammable gas and reducible gas. This is released after the heating. As such, there should be proper antecedent basis for the recited subject matter of claim 16. It is respectfully submitted that the specification does provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The requirements of 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) should be satisfied. As such, it is respectfully requested that any objection to the specification now be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner is thanked for noting that misnumbered claim 20 has been renumbered as claim 21. The Examiner also alleges that claims 3, 5, 11 and 18 fail to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this objection should be overcome. These claims now relate to the material as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c) is requested.

Claims 8, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The specific temperature and time range as required by the Examiner have now been included in claims 8, 14 and 21. As such, this rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph should now be overcome. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, the spelling of “silicon” has been corrected. Moreover, it is simply cited that “Me is silicon.” These claims 2, 6, 12 and 19 have been rewritten into independent form as suggested by the Examiner and, as such, this portion of the rejection should be overcome. Furthermore, the portion of the rejection regarding claims 8, 14 and 21 has been discussed. Finally, regarding claims 9, 15 and 22, their dependencies have been changed, such that there should now be proper antecedent basis for “the reduction gas.” It is respectfully submitted that all claims should particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the instant invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of co-pending Appl. No. 10/711,002. This rejection is respectfully

traversed. Simply to expedite prosecution of this application, a Terminal Disclaimer is being filed herewith. This Terminal Disclaimer should overcome this objection.

Claim 1 stands objected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese document 74(49)-3631.

Claims 1, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,669,866. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patents 6,669,866 and 6,552,487. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 17 and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patents 6,596,195 and 6,765,237. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 10, 13 and 16 to be allowable. Also, it is gratefully acknowledged that allowable subject matter is present in claims 2, 6, 19, 12 and 15.


The subject matter of claim 2 has now been incorporated into claim 1. The subject matter of claim 6 has been incorporated into claim 4. The subject matter of claim 12 has been incorporated into claim 10, and the subject matter of claim 19 has been incorporated into claim 17. As such, the 35 USC 102(b), 102(e) and 103 rejections should now be overcome. All claims in the instant application should now be in condition for allowance. Thus, favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

In the event that any outstanding matters remain in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees. . .

Dated: June 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joe McKinney Muncy

Registration No.: 32,334

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant